

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 9-14 remain pending in the application. Applicants amend claims 1 and 9 for clarification, and refer to Fig. 1 and its corresponding description in the specification for exemplary embodiments of and support for the amendments. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has not acknowledged the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document (Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-203183). Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement of the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show a plurality of portable communication terminals and separate input devices.

Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that reference number 17 clearly illustrates a physically separate but logically coupled input device. As shown in Fig. 1, input device 17 is not physically incorporated in portable communication terminal 1 and is merely coupled thereto via a signal line. Fig. 1 includes a signal line for illustrating a logical connection therebetween, which one skilled in the art would have understood to allow for physical separateness—please see, e.g., page 9, lines 9-16 of the specification—an input device 17 may be connectable to a portable communication terminal 1 for use therewith, but may also be physically separate.

With respect to the plurality of portable communication terminals, Applicants point out to the Examiner that one skilled in the art would plainly understand that the game of golf may be played by a group of up to four players in one group and there would usually be more than one player on a golf course at a time. Applicants also point out that one skilled in the art of networking would understand that a satellite network 5, a communication network 3, and a data

center 2 may accommodate more than one portable communication terminal 1. As such, with reference to page 8, lines 7-8 in the specification, Applicants point out that Fig. 1 clearly illustrates the feature of the claimed invention of having a portable communication terminal 1 being carried by an individual player where the player records each stroke played at a first hole. It would be unreasonable to interpret Fig. 1 as excluding, e.g., more than one hole at a golf course or having more than one portable communication terminal 1.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that he was uncertain as to how the "shot button" works or what it is in comparison to the "input" button and "holed out" button as used in claim 4. The Examiner also stated that he was uncertain as to how measurement data may be stored prior to making a shot. Applicants respectfully point out that Fig. 7 and its corresponding description in the specification clearly illustrate one embodiment of the use of a "shot button," and that one skilled in the art of electronics would clearly understand the operation thereof. Applicants refer to page 13, lines 4-12 in the specification where an illustrative embodiment is described of a "shot button," which may be one of "input buttons" 20, being pressed to indicate a start of a round. Applicants also refer to Fig. 7 and page 14, lines 28-32 as an illustration of embodiments where measurement data includes latitude/longitude/altitude, and such location data is received from a tee box before a shot is made. Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would clearly understand that such information may be used to determine a desired distance of a shot to be made for, say, club selection.

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. With respect to claim 4, the Examiner stated that he was unclear "by whom or on

which device the input button is pressed.” Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the claim recites “an input button is pressed at a location of a shot or a putt” which distinctly claims the condition for the claimed feature of the recording part in the portable communication terminal.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner objected to the apparent contradiction of “separate” and “coupled.” As discussed above, Applicants point out that two physically separate devices may nevertheless be communicatively “coupled.” For example, communication may be performed wirelessly, which would render the communicating devices completely “separate.” Indeed, a communication terminal and an input device coupled through a signal line may, nevertheless, be physically separate with their respective individual housings. The Examiner also objected to the term “the received data” for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants point to the data receiving step as providing the antecedent basis.

Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,245,537 to Barber; and, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber; and claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Barber discloses a portable device for use by an individual golfer to track performance, determine distance, club selection, etc. As shown in Figs. 4 and 5, Barber describe a physically-integrated single unit device that includes a keypad 18 and a display device 20. With this integrated custom device, Barber does not disclose or even provide consideration for a communication device that is connectable to a separate input device.

Therefore, Barber, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, fails to disclose,

“transmitting play data or practice data to the portable communication terminal from an input device separate from said

portable communication terminal wherein said input device is coupled to the portable communication terminal via a signal line, infrared signal or radio-frequency signal," as recited in claim 9.
(Emphasis added)

Advantageously, the claimed invention provides for a portable communication terminal that may be used for more than one purpose. Please see, e.g., page 8, lines 21-29 of the specification. As such, it is advantageous that the terminal is connectable to a separate "golfing" input device for inputting golf data. Therefore, the nonobviousness of the claimed invention over Barber is not simply making a custom "golfing" device or structure described in Barber portable or separable, but providing a platform that is usable with a multi-purpose communication terminal, such as a portable telephone, where a separate input device may be coupled thereto—via signal line, infrared, or radio-frequency—for inputting the golf data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, together with claims 10-11 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Barber for at least the above-stated reasons. The Examiner took Official Notice of the additional charging features recited in dependent claims 13 and 14. Applicants, therefore, submit that claims 13 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons as those for their base claim 9.

Claims 1-6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,507,485 to Fisher in view of Barber.

The Examiner acknowledged that

"Fisher does not disclose wherein said portable communication terminal is carried by each player and is connectable to a separate input device via a signal line, infrared signal or radio frequency signal, and is configured to receive at least a portion of the play data from the separate input device."

The Examiner, thus, relied upon Barber as a combining reference that allegedly discloses this feature. As described above, Barber does not disclose

"wherein said portable communication terminal is carried by each player and is connectable to an input device separate from said portable communication terminal via a signal line, infrared signal or radio-frequency signal, and is configured to receive at least a portion of the play data from the input device," as recited in claim 1, and the corresponding feature recited in claim 9. (Emphasis added)


Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 1, together with claims 2-6 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Fisher and Barber, individually and in combination, for at least the above-stated reasons. Claim 12 depends from claim 9, which incorporates the above-cited features. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

The above statements on the disclosure in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference that provide the basis for a view contrary to any of the above-stated opinions.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NO.: 026304
Telephone No.: (212) 940-6384
Fax No.: (212) 940-8986/87
Docket No.: 100794-11611 (FUJI 18.311)
DTC:par